



Supplementary Planning Committee

Wednesday 4 March 2015 at 7.00 pm

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

Membership:

Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)
Colacicco (Vice-Chair)
Agha
S Choudhary
Filson
Hylton
Kansagra
Mahmood

Substitute Members

Councillors:

Chohan, A Choudry, Conneely, Duffy,
Ezeajughi, W Mitchell Murray and M Patel

Councillors

Colwill

For further information contact: Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer
020 8937 1354, joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

democracy.brent.gov.uk

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

Members' briefing will take place at 6.15pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8

Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

ITEM	WARD	PAGE
7. Final supplementary		1 - 6
8. Minutes of the last meeting - 11 February 2015		7 - 16

Agenda Item 7

Agenda Item 03

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 4 March, 2015 Case No. 14/4208

Location Bowling Club and Collins Lodge, King Edward VII Park, Park Lane, Wembley
 Description Change of use of the bowling pavillion and adjoining land (Use class D2) into a primary school (Use class D1) also including the erection of a single storey classroom block, and part change of use of the land adjoining Collins Lodge (Use class C3) into parkland (Use class D2)

Supplementary Report

Agenda Page Number: 5

Additional representations received

14 additional objections have been received (two of which previously objected to the proposal). The following concerns have previously been raised and discussed within the main committee report:

- Traffic congestion
- Access to school from within the Park and potential safety concerns
- Loss of green space
- Loss of a community facility
- School is fee paying and does not serve the local population in Brent
- Reference made to loss of community facilities in Barham Park

In addition to the above, the following points have been raised and discussed below:

Query what is the Council procedure for the disposal of buildings within Parks, and whether this is considered in light of policies regarding the protection of open space and recreation

The Council's Property and Projects Department are developing a Community Asset Strategy to assist in responding to requests by other groups for community or other space. In terms of the planning process, any proposal for the use of the former bowling green pavillion and associated land as a community use that falls within use class D1 will be subject to planning permission, and assessed in accordance with national and local planning policies and other material considerations.

Why the school has not been relocated as part of the proposed Stonebridge Expansion

Brent's Cabinet on Monday 23rd February considered the 'Stonebridge redevelopment proposals including Primary School Expansion and the Stonebridge Day Centre - update' report and decided that approval be given to the revised principles of redevelopment which included that the school building currently let to the Welsh School revert back to the Stonebridge Primary School.

Field of Trust have an interest in the land and as a result this planning application should not have been considered

Brent submitted an application to Fields in Trust on 28/11/2014, which is after the submission of this planning application on 28/10/2014. Fields in Trust and the Planning System are two separate application processes. Obtaining planning permission would not remove the need for Fields in Trust permission.

Details of the location of where pupils travel from and method of transport should be provided to be able to assess the highway impact

The highways consideration of the proposal has been considered by officers in Transportation who have recommended that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the local road network, and have suggested that a Travel Plan is secured as part of any forthcoming consent. This has been recommended within the conditions.

Reference made to loss of community facilities in Barham Park

The proposals at Barham Park form part of separate planning applications, and have therefore not been

considered as part of the consideration of this proposal.

Response to representations received by Wembley Crime Prevention

The Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer has reiterated concerns relating to crime by virtue of the access through the park. However, as set out previously, the school is proposed to operate during the opening hours of the park (0800 to 1600 Mondays to Fridays) and children are likely to be supervised or accompanied by an adult. It is not clear how the safety risks will be more significant than for other park users.

Recommendation: Remain approval subject to conditions set out after paragraph 38 of the main Committee Report.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 04

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 4 March, 2015

Case No.

14/4573

Location	Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley
Description	Proposed erection of theatre (Use Class <i>Sui Generis</i>) on corner of Fulton Road and Olympic Way incorporating a restaurant, foyer, bar area, back of house facilities, and associated landscaping, bicycle parking and ancillary works for a temporary period of 10 years.

Agenda Page Number: 25

Committee Site Visit

Members queried the following matters during the committee site visit.

Design, appearance and materials

Further images have been provided showing how the theatre will be visually articulated and made interesting, together with images of the existing theatre within the Netherlands. It is considered that the submission provides sufficient comfort that the design and materials for the building will be of sufficient quality despite the temporary nature of the consent. The approval of materials is secured through condition.

Implications for Community Infrastructure Levy payments if the temporary consent is renewed

CIL becomes payable if a permanent consent is subsequently granted. Whether CIL is payable in situations where a temporary consent is granted for another temporary period of time is not set out within the CIL regulations. However, it is considered that the renewal of the proposed (10 year) temporary consent with another temporary consent would also require the payment of CIL for the development given the resulting total length of the temporary consent.

Olympic Way / Fulton Road Crossing

Members queried whether the crossing at the junction of Olympic Way and Fulton Road is to be improved. The crossing is part of the adopted highway and is controlled by the Council. Highways have been looking into this issue and that have plans to reduce the speed limit along this part of Fulton Road to 20 mph. Highways have commented that Quintain have suggested improvements that they are willing to fund. The Council is looking at further options for this crossing, including the narrowing of the road or provision a pelican or zebra crossing. However, schemes have not been developed yet as Highways are waiting until further information becomes available regarding future development within Wembley to ascertain how these may affect this junction.

Solar panels

The construction of the adjoining plots to the south of the theatre will result in some overshadowing of the proposed PV panels. However, a solar study has been submitted to show that the level of overshadowing will be relatively limited between the spring equinox and autumn equinox. Whilst overshadowing may reduce the output of the PV panels to some extent, the building is only proposed to be in place for a temporary period of time and the carbon reductions associated with the PV panels are likely to be experienced for a reasonable period of time. It should be noted that the primary means to reduce carbon dioxide emissions associated with this development are the improvements to the fabric of the proposed building (exceeding the minimum u-values specified within the Building Regulations by a reasonable amount). Your officers consider that the proposal achieves a good level of carbon reduction given the temporary nature of the proposal.

Scope for temporary housing on sites pending development

Quintain has been and is continuing to explore potential “temporary uses” on its land prior to redevelopment. Temporary uses that have been implemented to date include the Powerleague football centre, the LDO children’s play area and events area, the lawns adjacent to the Hilton and “market square” adjacent to the Civic Centre. Quintain has been discussing the potential to use other land that it owns within Wembley for temporary purposes with your officers and these discussions will continue to take place. The availability of land for temporary uses is currently affected by the need to provide 2,900 car parking spaces (or coach and minibus parking spaces or a combination thereof) for Wembley Stadium Events. There will be more opportunities for temporary uses on Quintain’s land, particularly once a new multi-storey Stadium Car Park is constructed to the east of the stadium. The timing of this is not known at present.

Disabled seating

Details of the number and location of disabled seating places have been submitted. A total of 14 spaces have been shown which exceeds the level (1 % of seating) set out within the Technical Standards for places of entertainment.

Implications of increase in parking demand on Stadium Event Days

The majority of the 2,900 car parking spaces for stadium events are provided within the red multi-storey car park (approximately 1,000 spaces) and the green car park (approximately 1,700 spaces). The remaining car parking spaces are currently provided within the yellow car park but can be provided in other locations within Wembley once the yellow car park is developed, such as the Retail Park on Engineers Way.

Almost all of the unauthorised car parks that operate on Stadium event days are situated to the east of the Stadium within the industrial estate. There are very few locations within which unauthorised parking could take place near to the proposed theatre, significantly reducing the likelihood of unauthorised car parks being set up by third parties for the theatre or for an increase in the demand for unauthorised car parks on Stadium Event days.

In the event that the theatre would have a full capacity audience (1,300 people) when a full capacity stadium event is held (90,000 people), the theatre would only increase the number of people coming to Wembley by 1.4 %. The application submission demonstrates that the proposed theatre is unlikely to result in a significant change to the traffic and parking demand if this occurs.

Sound levels during shows

The Safer Streets officers commented that the proposal is unlikely to result in noise nuisance providing the insulation achieves or exceeds the minimum levels that are set out within the reports that accompany this planning application. The reference to “minimum levels” accordingly refers to the levels of insulation required to achieve a satisfactory environment rather than inferring that the levels of insulation that are proposed are minimal.

Vibration during construction

The condition that has been recommended for this application is identical to that attached to the recently approved applications relating to Quintain Plot NW06 and the open space. Fountain Studios were provided with details of these conditions and have not objected to their use or wording.

MET Police condition

The MET Police have requested that conditions are added to the consent regarding measures that may be required to ensure that the proposed development is suitable resilient to terrorism. It is accordingly recommended that an additional condition is attached to the consent requiring the submission and approval of details relating to the resilience to terrorism. This submission, when received by the Council, will be discussed with the MET Police.

Recommended condition: Details of any proposed counter-terrorism measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the MET Police prior to the commencement of construction works and the approved details shall be implemented in full prior to completion of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development accords with Policy 7.13 of the London Plan 2011.

Minor amendments to conditions 17 (external lighting) and 21 (landscape work)

It is recommended that the “triggers” for these conditions are amended so that the lighting details are required to be approved prior to installation and the details of landscape works are provided within 3 months of the commencement of works.

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the conditions recommended with the Committee Report, amendments to recommended conditions 17 and 21 and an additional conditions relating to the resilience of the

development to terrorism.

DocSuppF

Agenda Item 05

Supplementary Information

Planning Committee on 4 March, 2015

Case No.

14/4254

Location	18 Neasden Lane and 450 High Road, London, NW10
Description	Demolition of existing Vicarage and yard, and erection of a part 5, part 6-storey building comprising a ground floor commercial unit (Use Class B1) (50sqm) and 47 residential flats (18 x 1 bed, 17 x 2 bed, 11 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed) with associated car, cycle and motorbikes spaces, landscaping, new metal railing fence and amenity space

Agenda Page Number: 51

SITE VISIT

During the Committee site visit clarification was sought on a number of issues. The issues raised are addressed below.

Drainage

Clarification was sought on the measures that would be put in place to ensure that the development does not worsen problems with localised flooding, particularly on the adjacent roundabout. This issue was raised by the Unity Neighbourhood Forum in their representations and has been addressed under paragraph 44 of the main committee report. The proposed development would be subject to a s106 agreement that would require the development to be designed to comply with Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. A mandatory requirement of meeting code level 4 is that the site rainfall run-off rate must be the same post-construction as it is at present. The submitted sustainability strategy sets out that this requirement is likely to be met through the provision of a Stormcell storage system (or similar) located underneath of the car-parking area. During instances of heavy rain this would effectively store excess rainwater until such time that it can be slowly drained away.

For clarification, in terms of the threat of flooding from rivers or other watercourses the site is located in an area of Flood Risk level 1, where the threat of this type of flooding is at its lowest.

Ebony Court

Clarification was sought on the separation distances between the proposed development and Ebony Court. On the upper floors the distance between the northern elevation of the proposed development and the southern elevation of Ebony Court would be approximately 21m. On the ground floor only, the proposed refuse store projects towards Ebony Court but a distance of approximately 18m is maintained.

Density

Clarification was sought on the density of the proposed development. The density of the proposed development is 642 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) or 224 units per hectare (u/ha). The site is considered to be within an urban setting where the PTAL level is currently 3 and therefore the London Plan suggests that appropriate densities are up to 450 hr/ha and 170u/ha. Although the proposed density is above those set out in the London Plan it should be noted that should the PTAL level increase to 4, which is expected when additional bus services are provided through the area (see para 37 of the main committee report) then the recommended density range would rise to up to 700hr/ha and 260u/ha which the proposed development would satisfy. In any case, the London Plan and the Mayors Housing SPG set out that the density matrix should be applied flexibly taking into account local context and circumstances and given that the site is located within an identified borough.

Boundary treatment to Magistrates Court

Clarification was sought on the proposed boundary treatment between the site and the Magistrates Court. The submitted plans and design and access statement suggest this edge will be treated with a 2.5m high perforated metal fence with hedge planting along the inner edge. The detailed design of this fence has not been included as part of the submission. However, as recommended in the main report any permission should be subject to a condition requiring the submission of further details of all landscaping proposals, including boundary treatments, for approval. Should the proposed fence be found to have an unacceptable appearance then a more

sympathetic boundary treatment can be negotiated during the discharge of the condition.

Commercial Unit

Clarification was sought as to whether there was any further information in respect of potential tenants for the proposed commercial space. Officers do not have any further information at the present time but if, despite the discounted rents, a commercial tenant cannot be found then alternative uses, including community uses, could be considered for the space. However, this would be subject to planning permission.

OTHER AMENDMENTS

Members are advised of a typo in paragraph 10 of the main committee report. The tenure split on the proposed affordable housing should read 74% shared ownership and **26%** affordable rented.

Under the heading 'Existing' in the main report the site area for the stone masons should read 0.02ha.

A revised third floor plan has been submitted which now correctly identifies a 3-bedroom unit on this floor for shared-ownership rather than the one-bedroom unit identified on the previous plan.. The amended plan does not amend the provision of affordable housing reported in the main committee report. To reflect this change condition 2 should be amended to read:-

"2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:-

Plans

NDL/P13/01 Location Plan
 NDL/P13/02A Topographic Survey
 NDL/P13/03 Context Plan
 NDL/P13/04A Site Layout and Ground Floor Plan
 NDL/P13/05A First Floor Plan
 NDL/P13/06A Second Floor Plan
NDL/P13/07B Third Floor Plan
 NDL/P13/08 Fourth Floor Plan
 NDL/P13/09 Fifth Floor Plan
 NDL/P13/12 Cross Section AA
 NDL/P13/13 West Elevation to Neasden Lane
 NDL/P13/14 South Elevation to High Road
 NDL/P13/15 North Elevation
 NDL/P13/16 East Elevation Facing Magistrates Court

Documents

Accommodation Schedule dated 28.01.2015 by PAC Design;
 CGI Image 1 View from south
 CGI Image 1 View from south (with landscaping ghosted)
 CGI Image 2 View from south east
 CGI Image 2 View from south east (with landscaping ghosted)
 Air Quality Report by Air Quality Consultants;
 Arboricultural Report by AP Arboriculture;
 Archaeology Report by Pre Construct Archaeology;
 Design & Access Statement by Landmark Landscape Planning;
 Financial Viability Appraisal by Affordable 106;
 Heritage Statement by Morse Heritage;
 Noise Report by DKN Acoustics;
 Sunlight, Daylight & Overshadowing Report by Herrington Consulting;
 Sustainability Statement by Maven Sustainability;
 Transport Statement by Dermot McCaffery Highway and Transport Consultants;
 Planning Statement by Maven Plan Limited.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning."

Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the conditions (as amended) and s106 agreement as set out in the main report.

DocSuppF

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 11 February 2015 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Marquis (Chair), Councillor Colacicco (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Agha, S Choudhary, Filson, Hylton, Kansagra and Mahmood

Also present: Councillors Daly, Hoda-Benn, McLennan, Pavey and Perrin

1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

3. Land adjacent to Quality Hotel and Dexion House, Fulton Road
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
4. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Roaf (Ref. 14/4541)
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
5. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Roaf (Ref. 14/4555)
All members received a presentation and emails from the applicant.
7. Car Park next to 34, Rokesby Place, Wembley
All members received representations from Mr Paul Lorber.
Councillor Marquis received an email from Councillor Daly.
8. Land at junction of Yeats Close and Great Central Way NW10
Councillor Choudhary declared pecuniary interest as a board member of Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), he vacated the meeting room when this application was heard and took no part in the discussion and voting on the application.

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 January 2015 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. **Land adj to Quality Hotel and Dexion House, Fulton Road Wembley (Ref. 14/4330)**

PROPOSAL:

Proposed erection of 1- to 20-storey building comprising 370 residential units, 693 sqm of non-residential floor space (use class A1 (retail), A2 (financial and professional), A3 (cafe/restaurant), B1(Business), D1 (community) or D2 (assembly and leisure)) and associated residential parking spaces, private

communal landscaped garden, ancillary spaces, and associated plant, landscaping, cycle storage and refuse provision.

The application is submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters in relation to Layout, Scale, Appearance, Access and Landscape), 9 (Noise), 23 (Sustainability Implementation Strategy) and 28 (Affordable Housing Storage) in relation to Plot NW06 of outline planning permission reference 14/3054 which varied outline planning consent reference 13/1323 (section 73 application) and 10/3032 (original consent), with details also submitted pursuant to paragraphs 4 (Affordable Housing), 10.5 (Demolition), 12 (sport and play space) and 19 (Brent Access Forum) of the first schedule of the Section 106 legal agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant approval of the Reserved Matters subject to conditions after paragraph 45 and approve details pursuant to conditions 1, 9, 23 and 28 in relation to plot NW06.

Members agreed that the Area Planning Manager be allowed to introduce application reference numbers 14/4330, 14/4541 and 14/4555 simultaneously as they were interlinked. Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) explained the description of the applications with the help of a slide presentation. In reference to condition 8 which required the provision of at least 8 additional three-bedroom flats within the building she confirmed that the applicant had submitted revised drawings showing that 3 bedroom flats had been incorporated into the development on floors 15 to 19 of the proposed building. The revised plans therefore updated condition 1 and omitted condition 8. Members heard that the three applications that are being considered would deliver 370 homes together with some key elements of social and physical infrastructure including the 0.4 Ha park and the 300 square metre community hall.

The Area Planning Manager added that the design and layout of the proposed park and pocket park was considered to be acceptable subject to the approval of further details regarding hard landscaping, planting and play provision pursuant to conditions already attached to the outline consent. The proposed road layout was also considered to be acceptable subject to a new condition requiring a 10m kerb radii and raised table at the junction of “Wealdstone Road” and Fulton Road. Rachel Murrell also recommended a further condition to ensure that noise and disturbance from construction was minimised.

Anne Clements (on behalf of the applicant) stated that the linked applications would provide a reduced number of 362 homes, each dwelling unit with an appropriate quantum of open space, a proportion of which would be for affordable homes. She continued that the development would also provide a community hall (D1 use) and combined heating for sustainability. Members heard that the development would also provide employment to assist with the on-going wider regeneration of the Wembley Park area.

Members raised questions about affordable homes that the proposed development would deliver in terms of quantity and size of dwelling units. Anne Clements was also asked to clarify issues regarding Section 106 social infrastructure including the provision of education and the review mechanism for the value of homes built on NW01 lands which could trigger an increase in affordable homes that could

eventually become available. In general members expressed a view that the Council was disappointed in the total number of affordable homes that would be made available from such a significant development in the Wembley regeneration area.

In response Anne Clements stated that all of the homes would be built to Lifetime Homes standard with 10% wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable and 33 affordable homes were proposed. Quintain would partner a registered social landlord (RSL) and housing officers to deliver the allocation of homes. She added that under the Section 106 agreement the number of affordable homes would be reviewed in 2016 when the buildings on NW01 lands were completed. This allowed for the current 10% level of affordable homes to be increased up to 17.5%. Members heard that a Section 106 infrastructure requirement would provide space for D1 use which could be used either as a General Practitioner (GP) surgery or community hall. She continued that some £11million had been provided towards the provision of education subject to the Council identifying a suitable piece of land for that purpose. Anne Clements continued that Quintain would also provide a sum of £60,000 towards the improvement of bus shelters in the local area.

In bringing the discussion to a close, the Chair reiterated the Committee's disappointment at the low number of affordable homes that would be made available regardless of the review clause. The Chair also expressed hope that the developers would listen to the concerns of the Committee and work with the Council to increase the level of affordable housing in their future developments to be more in line with the 50% target set by the Council.

DECISION: Planning approval granted as recommended.

4. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref. 14/4541)

PROPOSAL: Proposed construction of park (publicly accessible open space), a "pocket park", access roads and other associated hard and soft landscaping works and infrastructure and alteration to existing access roads, and access to Fulton Road.

This application is submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters), 7 (visibility spay), 8 (c) Layout of internal and external spaces, 8(k) wind mitigation and 12 (Noise) of outline planning permission reference 14/3054 which varied outline planning consent reference 13/1323 (section 73 application) and 10/3032 (original consent), with details also submitted pursuant to paragraphs 4 (Affordable Housing), 10.5 (Demolition), 12 (sport and play space) and 19 (Brent Access Forum) of the first schedule of the Section 106 legal agreement.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant approval of the Reserved Matters and details pursuant to conditions 1 (Reserved Matters), 7 (visibility spay), 8 (c) Layout of internal and external spaces, 8(k) wind mitigation and 12 (Noise) in relation to the park and associated access roads.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

5. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref. 14/4555)

PROPOSAL: Proposed hard and soft landscaping works involving the construction of a new access road adjacent to the rear boundary of the Quality Hotel and Dexion House including footway and loading bays, substations and other associated hard and soft landscaping works.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant permission subject to conditions detailed after paragraph 7 of the Remarks Section of the this report.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

6. Uxendon Manor Primary School, Vista Way, Harrow (Ref. 14/3781)

PROPOSAL: Installation of single storey modular temporary classrooms in the playground of Uxendon Manor School

RECOMMENDATION: Grant temporary planning permission subject to conditions set out after paragraph 19.

Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) clarified that the proposal was for a temporary permission for a classroom with no additional increase in pupil numbers.

John Poole (objector) informed members that due to flash floods, the existing drainage and sewerage systems would not be able to cope with the increase in new buildings and thus population. He added that the proposal would have implications for Wealdstone Brook, the provision of playground and playing field facilities. In order to address this, he urged Planning Services to request Thames Water to enter into a binding commitment to review and upgrade the drainage and sewerage systems. John Poole continued that the increase in pupil numbers would lead to an increase in vehicular activity, pick up and drop off of pupils, resulting in noise nuisance and detrimental impact to pedestrian safety.

Rachel Murrell, Area Planning Manager clarified that the proposal was for a temporary classroom which would allow the school to re-instate the facilities lost in September 2014. She added that the School's existing travel plan was accredited with a silver award by the Council's school road safety team. In response to the request for network capacity investigation, she drew members' attention to the informative advising Thames Water as such, although there should not be a net impact on the rate or volume of water entering the drainage system. She advised that the applicant had provided details of flood management for the proposal which included a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with the Environment Agency's standing advice, drawing members' attention to the applicant's comments as set out in the main report. She however added a further condition that the School's flood management plan be updated prior to the occupation of the unit.

Members emphasised the need for the school to work towards achieving a high level travel plan, a gold award and added that the concerns expressed at the meeting be passed on to Thames Water and the Council's Transportation unit.

DECISION: Granted temporary planning permission subject to conditions set out after paragraph 19 of the main report and subject to additional informative reminding of the importance of objectives of School Travel Plan with an aim to achieve a gold award.

7. Car Park Next to Rokesby Place, Wembley (Ref. 14/4078)

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2 semi-detached houses and associated hard and soft landscaping including the provision of parking spaces, bins and bike stores, and alterations to existing parking and landscaped areas (as amended plans).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions listed after paragraph 51 of the remarks section of the main report and an additional condition to secure the applicant's agreement to carry out a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation..

With reference to the supplementary report, Rachel Murrell (Area Planning Manager) summarised the additional list of objections received since the report was published. These included reference to the use of the car park, Rokesby Place as an adopted road, turning room for lorries, parking facilities for local residents and, over-development of the site. She informed members that in an attempt to address residents' concerns, the applicant, Brent Housing Partnership (BHP) had removed the proposed changes to the parking arrangements. She added that as the land was not within the control of BHP, they withdrew their 'Wings' permit scheme and agreed to fund consultation on the CPZ. She recommended an additional condition to secure that. In respect of concerns for over-development, with regards to the turning head, the Area Planning Manager advised that as refuse vehicles were not currently using the car park for turning but rather reversing up Rokesby Place, the proposal would not alter the current situation. Members heard that as the minimum distance between the proposal and 24 Crawford Avenue was in excess of the standard set out in SPG17, the proposal complied with guidance in terms of protecting the privacy of adjoining occupiers and would not result in overlooking.

In respect of disabled parking provision, Rachel Murrell noted that whilst currently there was no dedicated disabled parking provision, as an adopted highway, residents could make an application for a marked bay to be provided which would be considered by Transportation. The third space proposed as part of the application (the 'visitor space) was not of sufficient size to accommodate a disabled space. In terms of impact on amenity, she advised that as the site was a car park, limited weight could be given to any value as an amenity/play area in the assessment. She confirmed that the tree identified would be removed.

Nila Gor (objector) informed members that the withdrawal of the 'Wings' permit scheme had resulted in inadequate parking spaces for residents, adding that the car park had been in regular use rather than being redundant. She also expressed concerns about inadequate turning room for vehicles and lack of disabled parking spaces. In response to members' questions, the objector stated

that there were only 17 spaces and that vehicles reversed in from Copland Avenue due to inadequate turning room, particularly for refuse vehicles.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, the following Councillors made representations:-

Councillor Hoda-Benn stated that she had been approached by an objector for whom she read out a statement to the Committee. Councillor Hoda-Benn highlighted the loss of car park, especially for disabled persons, loss of safe play area and accessibility issues which residents felt had not been addressed by BHP. Members heard that there were about 8 blue badge holders on the estate who would be deprived of parking facilities.

Councillor Daly stated that she had been approached by local residents. Councillor Daly echoed similar sentiments and added that the application did not comply with the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act (Equality Act) and policy BE4 on access for disabled people. She urged members to refuse the application.

Councillor McLennan (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing) informed the Committee that part of the current administration's target was to build affordable homes so as to be able to release families trapped in temporary accommodation and the private sector housing. She urged members to approve the application.

Keith Harley (Director of Development, BHP) stated that the proposed development which complied with design guidance and lifetime homes would provide increased family sized accommodation with an appropriate standard quality of accommodation in the Borough. The design of the new dwelling houses which was considered acceptable would not adversely impact on the amenities of adjoining properties as was the layout and parking provision for the site which were also considered acceptable. He added that in light of comments from residents, changes were made to the scheme to ensure it complied with the Council Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Officers had ensured that outstanding issues including the cost of consultation for CPZ would be addressed by imposition of conditions.

In response to members' questions on parking issues, Keith Harley stated that the majority of the parking spaces would be on-street and that as Rokesby Place was an adopted road, BHP could not make changes to its layout. Mr Harley was not able to indicate to the Committee where the proposed 20 parking spaces would be situated but stated that BHP would work with Transportation Officers to progress the parking issues raised. Patricia Bramwell, legal representative, advised that members' questions on refund of money to residents for the 'Wings' scheme were not relevant for planning consideration.

Councillor Kansagra noted that the tightness of the site would reduce parking spaces and worsen the area's parking situation and urged refusal. The Chair moved an amended motion for deferral for further consideration of matters relating to access for emergency vehicles/servicing, provision of parking spaces, scope for disabled parking and the width of the pavement. This was put to the vote and

declared carried. Voting on the amended motion for deferral was recorded as follows:

FOR:	Councillors Marquis, Agha, Filson, Hylton and Mahmood	(5)
AGAINST:	Councillor Colacicco	(1)
ABSTENTION:	Councillor Kansagra	(1)

DECISION: Deferred for further consideration of matters relating to access for emergency vehicles/servicing, provision of parking spaces, scope for disabled parking and the width of the pavement.

8. Land Junction at Yeats Close and Great Central Way, NW10 (Ref. 14/4469)

PROPOSAL: Erection of a warehouse / industrial building for flexible use within Use Class B1(b) (research and development), B1(c) (light industry), B2 (general industry) and/or B8 (storage or distribution) purposes with ancillary B1(a) (office) floor space on the first and second floors; vehicle, cycle and bike parking, landscaping and fencing.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed after paragraph 27, the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Head of Planning or other duly authorised person to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Chief Legal Officer.

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) informed members that the site was owned by Brent Council and that Oxfordshire County Council provided day to day management of the fixed travellers site opposite the development site. Residents parked their vehicles on the travellers' site with overspill on Yeats Close, although management ensured that the road way into the site was not blocked in order to allow access for emergency and refuse vehicles. Officers reviewed the site to see if there were access alternatives but could not identify any. He continued that if a new main entrance was created on Yeats Close it would need to be at least 40m from the roundabout junction at Great Central Way, so as to minimise the risk of queuing back from the roundabout and avoid blocking access into the site. This arrangement would give sufficient space for articulated lorries to straighten up and get into position to turn into the site. He continued that if double yellow lines were painted on both sides of Yeats Close, parking which would otherwise be available on the southern side of the road would be removed.

The arrangement as currently proposed had a secondary opening onto Yeats Close, which would not be used as an entrance for large vehicles and as such would not require yellow lines on both sides of the road. Members heard that Transportation had accepted a request for a Traffic Regulation Order which would add parking controls (double yellow lines) to the northern side of the road along the development site. The proposal would allow for parking to be maintained on the southern side to accommodate overspill parking from Lynton Close. He advised that the height of the fence had been proposed at 4m to follow the recommendations of the acoustic report and to allow access for vehicles with

refrigeration units to access the site and also minimise potential noise from such machinery. The proposed height of the building was noted but, in terms of the local context, it was not considered a significant reason for refusal. Andy Bates also referred to two additional conditions as set out in the supplementary report.

Sara Corchran (objector) informed the Committee that due to over-occupation of the travellers' site, residents were experiencing problems with parking and expressed concerns about the safety of children on the estate as HGV vehicles reversed into Lynton Close. She continued that as a result of the over-occupation, the residents of Lynton Close were having to park on Yeats Close. In her view, measures suggested by officers to address the parking problems would not work.

Les West (applicant's agent) stated that the application was in accordance with National Planning Framework. He added that impact from the proposal had been kept to the minimum with an acoustic fence and improved visual amenity. He continued that Yeats Close was suitable for heavy traffic and that there was no need for vehicles to reverse into Yeats Close. In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent stated that it was the responsibility of the Council's Highways Authority rather than the applicant to ensure that public highways were kept free of traffic. He added that an acoustic fence would be erected as an additional measure to alleviate and mitigate pollution.

In bringing the discussion to an end, the Chair observed that there were unanswered questions regarding parking issues including the width of the entrance to the site. She therefore moved an amendment for deferral for investigations into issues relating to the parking facilities and the impact of double yellow lines on lorries using the site and residents of Lynton Close. In addition the Chair indicated that members also had concerns about the width of the entrance, airborne pollution in connection with the use of the site, whether speed humps would be appropriate, 24 hour access and waiting of HGV, location of the gates and recommended the applicant consider clear signage to warn HGV drivers to be alert to the residential area and children's play area.

The amendment was put to the vote and declared carried. Voting on the amended motion for deferral was recoded as follows:

FOR: Councillors Marquis, Choudhary, Filson, Hylton, Kansagra and Mahmood	(6)
AGAINST: None	(0)
ABSTENTION: Councillors Agha and Colacicco	(2)

DECISION: Deferred for investigations into the parking and access to the development site. The following issues were raised for further review by the Council and the applicant - the width of the entrance, airborne pollution in connection with the use of the site, speed humps, 24 hour access and waiting vehicles, location of the gate and tracking information about vehicles entering the site and signage.

9. Land rear of 114-116 Dollis Hill Lane, London NW2 6JA (Ref. 14/3953)

PROPOSAL: Erection of four (x4 bed) semi detached dwelling houses including formation of off street parking and associated landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions listed after paragraph 21

With reference to the supplementary report, Andy Bates (Area Planning Manager) clarified the position on drainage and added that surface water had been satisfactorily considered to ensure that the development did not result in excessive run off to drains from the site. In respect of neighbours' comments, he clarified that Homestead Park to the west of Orchard Close was within a conservation area but Orchard Close was not and that the proposal incorporated comprehensive landscaping scheme which would maintain the existing trees where appropriate and additional planting of 4 new trees to enhance the northern end of the site.

Mark Pender (applicant's agent) informed members that the revised scheme complied with Council planning policies and the London Plan with acceptable density levels, better layout and high quality design. He added that the Council's Transportation Officers were satisfied with the scheme which would deliver 8 car parking spaces in an area with a low PTAL and without controlled parking.

DECISION: Planning permission granted as recommended.

10. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting ended at 10.20pm

S MARQUIS
CHAIR

Note: at 10.00pm, the Committee voted to disapply the guillotine procedure to allow all applications to be considered on the night.

This page is intentionally left blank